



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2004

Ms. Laura C. Rodriguez
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2004-3669A

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2004-3669 (2004) on May 5, 2004. We have examined this ruling and determined that we made an error. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on May 5, 2004. *See generally* Gov't Code 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act")).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 200790.

The Southwest Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any information regarding: (1) any investigations of a named individual including witness statements; (2) any communications from parents regarding this individual, and (3) any documents sent from or to the State Board for Educator Certification. You state that the district has redacted student identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232(g) of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You also state that the district has released some of the responsive

¹ FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1); *see also* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining personally identifiable information). This office generally applies the same analysis under FERPA and section 552.114 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990). This office has determined that a governmental body may withhold student identifying information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from disclosure under section 552.114 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions. Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995).

information. You claim, however, that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the common-law right to privacy addressed in *Industrial Foundation* to records of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The information at issue in *Ellen* included third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of misconduct responded to the allegations of sexual harassment, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public’s interest in the matter. *Id.* The court further held, however, that “the public does not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.*

When there is an adequate summary of an investigation, the summary and any statements of the person under investigation must be released, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements.

The submitted information contains an adequate summary of the investigation into alleged sexual harassment. Therefore, you must withhold the submitted information except for the summary which must be released pursuant to *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, the identities of the victim and witnesses to the alleged sexual harassment are protected by the common-law privacy doctrine and must be withheld. *Id.* Contrarily, the public interest in the identity of the alleged harasser outweighs any privacy interest the alleged harasser may have in that information; therefore, the district may not withhold the alleged harasser’s identity under section 552.101. The public has no legitimate interest in the details of the victim’s and witnesses’ personal statements, and they may not be disclosed. *Id.* We have

marked the information in the adequate summary that must be withheld under common-law privacy. The remaining information in the summary must be released to the requestor.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other claimed exception.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Debbie K. Lee', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 200790

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. E. Matthew Guedea
Association of Texas Professional Educators
305 East Huntland Drive, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78752-3792
(w/o enclosures)